REMARKS

Claims 1-25, 27, 29-35, 37-42 and 45-53, and 55-59 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 5, 19, 21, 24, 32, 45, 52, and 53 have been currently amended while claims 26, 36, 43, 44, and 54 have been canceled in this response as shown on pages 2-9 of the Reply. In addition new claims 55 – 60 have been added. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as filed at page 4 lines 5-25, page 5 lines 13-15. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the teleconference of April 14, 2008 wherein merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited documents were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-31, 33, 41, 44-45 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-31, 33, 41, 44-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Jacobi *et al.* (U.S. 6, 064,980) in view of Demers (U.S. 20040068536). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system that facilitates reviewing and manipulating media *via* an interactive media frame that allows for viewing and/or manipulating media. To this end, amended independent claim 1 recites *a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely* browse, *manipulate,* and view *a plurality of media items stored in the at least one media store by interfacing with the host component, the media frame display retrieves a plurality of media items from the host media store, stores them in a local store and transmits back to the host media store the at least one of modified media items, add and delete operations performed on the media items, wherein the local data store is operably connected to the interactive media frame display*. Independent claim 24 and 45 recite similar features. Jacobi *et al.* and Demers, alone or in combination, do not disclose such novel features.

Jacobi *et al.* relates to a recommendation service that uses collaborative filtering techniques to recommend books to users of a Web site. A web server application is disclosed that allows a user to access a catalog of various titles offered by the application *via* a web site.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Jacobi *et al.* does not teach novel features of the subject invention. The Examiner cites Demers to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Jacobi *et al.*

Demers relates to providing a multimedia experience that can include audio, video and graphics, and also the transfer of information between a variety of sources. At the cited portions, Demers discloses a user receiving a CD, DVD or other magnetic media via surface mail and installing it in his PC, the content in the magnetic media is stored in the local data store. A broadcast code in the stored data facilitates establishing a two-way relationship with the user. Information about products and services is provided to the user via a GUI that allows the user to browse through the content in the local data store or website content *via* links, and make selections. However, Demers is silent regarding storing the content retrieved from the remote data store, in the local data store. In contrast, the claimed invention allows the user to retrieve content from a remote data store and store it in a local data store. Further, the system allows the user to perform operations of addition, deletion, grouping etc, or modify the content. The system then allows the user to transmit back the modified content or the operations performed on the content, back to the remote data store. However, Demers etc is silent regarding *a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely* browse, *manipulate* and view *a plurality of media items stored in the at least one media store by interfacing with the host component,* **the media frame display retrieves a plurality of media items from the host media store, stores them in a local store and transmits back to the host media store the at least one of modified media items, add and delete operations performed on the media items, wherein the local data store is operably connected to the interactive media frame display** as recited by the subject claims.

In view of the above, it is clear that Jacobi *et al.* and Demers, alone or in combination, do not disclose all limitations as recited in the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 24 and 45 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

I.b   Rejection of Claims 21, 22, 32, 34, 35, 52 and 58 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21, 22, 32, 34, 35, 52 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Jacobi, *et al.* in view of Demers. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at

least the following reasons. The cited references alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all claim features.

The claimed subject matter generally relates to a system for accessing media items for viewing and/or manipulation at a media frame component. To this end independent claim 52 recites *a media frame component that facilitates …….. a display cycle wherein a user designates one or more of a percentage of related media items to display in a single cycle or a time of display for each media item within the display cycle or a period for which each media item is displayed in the display cycle.* Jacobi, *et al.* and Demers alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

As stated *supra*, Jacobi, *et al.* relates to a recommendation service that uses collaborative filtering techniques to recommend books to users of a web site. On page 10 of the Office Action dated January 28, 2008, while it is erroneously contended that Jacobi, *et al.* teaches designating a percentage of media items having common metadata for viewing nowhere does the Examiner point to nor does applicants' representative find where Jacobi, *et al.* or Demers teaches a viewing cycle as recited in the subject claims. At the cited portion Jacobi, *et al.* discloses operation of a BookMatcher system when a rating event occurs wherein a rating of a signle titles by a single user may take place at any area of the web site. However, nowhere does Jacobi, *et al.* teach or suggest designating a percentage of media items having common metadata for viewing let alone teach or suggest a viewing cycle to display cyclically one or more media items wherein a user designates one or more of a percentage of related media items to be displayed in a single cycle, time of display for each media item or period of display for each media item as recited in independent claim 52 and similarly in claim 32.

Such a viewing cycle facilitates a user to designate a percentage or amount of media items to display for a given period (*e.g.*, for the month of December, display 50% of last year's Christmas photos, 40% of media items accessed by the frame in the last 10 days and 10% of randomly selected media items from the media store(s)). Therefore, each of the media items would appear as a slide show on the interactive media frame for a prescribed amount of time (*e.g.*, 10 seconds, 30 seconds, 20 minutes, etc.). Even further, the user can determine an amount of time selected media items are displayed for viewing. For example, the user can specify the following to be displayed: items created at the same time last year 50% of the time, Italy trip 30% of the time, items user specifically sent to the interactive media frame 10% of the time, and

random items pulled from the host/network media store 10% of the time) (*See* applicants' specification as filed page 4 lines 15-25). Jacobi, *et al.* and Demers fail to teach or suggest such aspects.

Similarly claims 21, 22, 34, 45, and 58 relate to associating a viewing/display cycle to a real time calendar so that a user can designate the period of time during which specific media items can be viewed/displayed as part of the cycle. As stated supra, this facilitates functionality wherein a user can specify *e.g.,* for the month of December, display 50% of last year's Christmas photos.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that none of the cited documents teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to dependent claims 21, 22, 34, 35, independent claim 52 and all claims that depend there from.

II.   Rejection of Claims 3, 11 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 11 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobi US Patent further in view of Demers further in view of Agarwal (U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0178946). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Neither Jacobi *et al.,* Demers nor Agarwal, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all limitations recited in the subject claims.

Claims 3, 11 and 25 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 24. As discussed *supra*, Jacobi *et al.* and Demers, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all features of independent claims 1 and 24. Agarwal relates to a system for creating gift clusters of multiple items in a client/server environment and for the ordering of such user defined gift clusters of multiple items. However Agarwal fails to disclose the *media frame display retrieves a plurality of media items from the host media store, stores them in a local store and transmits back to the host media store the at least one of modified media items or operations performed on the media items, wherein the local data store is operably connected to the interactive media frame display* as recited by the subject claims. Thus, Agarwal does not compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Jacobi *et al*, and Demers. The cited references alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all limitations recited in the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claims 42, 46 and 47 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 42, 46 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobi *et al.* further in view of Demers in view of Kronz (U.S. 6,675,196).   Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

Claims 42, 46 and 47 respectively depend from independent claims 24 and 45. As discussed *supra*, Jacobi *et al.* and Demers alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 24 and 45. Kronz relates to a method and apparatus for enabling any of a variety of devices to communicate with each other over a common or universal protocol. When Kronz is placed in combination with Jacobi *et al.*, and Demers, the combination fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Thus, Jacobi *et al.,* Demers or Kronz, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all claim limitations. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV.   Rejection of Claims 48-51 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 48-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobi *et al.* further in view of Demers further in view of Bendinelli *et al.* (U.S. 6,061,719). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Claims 48-51 respectively depend from independent claim 45. As discussed *supra*, Jacobi *et al.* and Demers, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all features of independent claim 45.   Bendinelli *et al.* relates to techniques for integrating television and computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Jacobi *et al.* and Demers.

Thus, even if the cited references were combined, as suggested, they would fail to teach or suggest all claim limitations. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP446USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

 /Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731